

Docket No. 202ES057A  
Serial No. 10/694,681  
Page 7

### REMARKS

Claim 15 was objected to because the spelling of the word "dimer" was incorrect. The claim has been amended to show the correct spelling.

Claim 1 (the only independent claim) has been amended to change the word --comprising-- to the narrower language "consisting essentially of". Claim 1 has also been amended to add the feature of original claim 26 such that claim 1 as amended recites that both of the soft and hard layers of the tube are biocompatible and biostable. The basis for this amendment can be found in original claim 26 and in Paragraph 0024 of the specification.

Claim 26 has been cancelled as it now is included in claim 1.

Claims 1-3, 6-22, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johansen et al. (U.S. Patent 4,303,457) in view of Wu (U.S. Patent 6,392,002). This rejection is respectfully traversed as to the amended claims.

The reference Johansen teaches a composite reinforced hose for paint spraying. The hose of Johansen dissipates static electrical charges by having the outer layer of the polymeric core be electrical conductive. Johansen's hose has two layers of fiber braiding on the outside of the core to give the hose pressure resistance. Johansen does teach, as the Examiner stated, that the core component of the hose can be two different aromatic polyurethanes having different hardness. Johansen prefers to use a nylon material for the inner layer of the core. Johansen's core tube uses two layers with the harder material being the inner layer to have better chemical resistance and the softer layer being the outer layer to have adhesion to the fiber braiding and flexibility (col. 4, lines 11-18).

The reference Wu teaches a polyurethane golf ball. Wu mentions the possibility of using an aliphatic isocyanate in their list of suitable isocyanates. Although, Wu's examples and the preferred embodiment is to use MDI (an aromatic isocyanate).

The Applicants' amended claims recite a tube which is made of at least two layers of aliphatic polyurethane (one soft and one hard). The amended claims also recite that both types of polyurethane are biocompatible and biostable. The intended use of the tube claimed by Applicants is for medical applications. The amended claims now use the more narrow language of "consisting essentially of" which would exclude using fiber braiding as taught by Johansen.

Docket No. 202ES057A  
Serial No. 10/694,681  
Page 8

One skilled in the art of making medical tubing would not consult the teachings of a braided paint spraying hose and a solid golf ball. The combined teachings of Johansen and Wu would not lead one skilled in the art to Applicants' invention. Johansen's core tube is for an entirely different purpose than the tube of the present application. There is no suggestion in either of the references which would lead one skilled in the art to combine the teaching of an aliphatic polyurethane used in a golf ball with a two layer core component in a paint spray hose to solve the problem that Applicants solved. Applicants solved the problem of single layer medical tubing made of soft polyurethane which was flexible but tacky. Single layer hard polyurethane tubing is not tacky but is also not flexible. By combining the hard and soft layers of polyurethane into one tube, Applicants solved the problem. The references taken together do not suggest such a solution.

It is believed that the amended claims are unobvious and patentable over Johansen in view of Wu. The Examiner is requested to reconsider and allow the amended claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Noveon IP Holdings Corp.  
9911 Brecksville Road  
Cleveland, Ohio 44141-3247  
Ph: (216) 447-5716  
Fax: (216) 447-5933

By Joe A. Powell  
Joe A. Powell  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 28,108

Date: Nov. 30, 2005  
202ES057A.Amd2.doc